UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,558	04/12/2006	Michael Schlick	10191/4209	5068
26646 KENYON & K	7590 01/22/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY		ALSOMIRI, ISAM A	
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3662	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,558	SCHLICK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ISAM ALSOMIRI	3662	
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ad	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communi - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statut - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 87 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON , by statute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this or BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed of the communication (s) filed of the comm	☐ This action is non-final. rallowance except for formal mat	·	e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 13-24 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 13-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction Application Papers	withdrawn from consideration.		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the E 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2005 is Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obje on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar e correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CF	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
•	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in A Ocuments have been the priority documents have been Ocuments have been Ocuments have been Ocuments have been Ocuments have been	Application No received in this National	Stage
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	-948) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brosche et al (DE 19963005 A1).

Referring to claims 13, 14, 16, 18-21, and 24, Brosche discloses in figures 2-8, a device for measuring a clearance distance and a speed of an object using radar pulses (see Abstract), comprising: a receiver-side mixer (18) that correlates received radar pulses with delayed transmitter-side radar pulses (11); a control device for specifying range gates within which radar pulses that are to be supplied to the mixer are continuously changeable increasingly and/or decreasingly with respect to their pulse delay (16); a switchover device for: for one of resetting and raising the delay to one of a current starting value and a new starting value; and an evaluating device for determining distance and speed values in response to an output signal from the mixer (see figures 2-4 and 8).

Referring to claim 15, wherein the evaluating device determines limits of the range gates based on the ascertained speed values (see abstract).

Referring to claim 17, wherein the evaluating device detects a moved object based on an increasing speed gradient/amplitude (see abstract).

Referring to claim 23. The device as recited in claim 13, wherein the evaluating device draws up estimated values for the speed measurements for expected crash situations (see Abstract)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brosche et al (DE 19963005 A1) in view of Mende (DE 19833327 A1)

Mende teaches an evaluating device draws up a clearance distance history from clearance distance measurements and detects object patterns based on the clearance distance history (see figures 3-5). It would have been obvious to further include the above clearance distance history and detect object patterns for better collision avoidance.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 29, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 13-24, applicant argues that "It is respectfully submitted that Brosche does not disclose or even suggest the feature of a switchover device. Indeed, Brosche does not even discuss any type of switchover device", and "There is no mention of speed measurements associated with a switchover device"

Page 4

(Remarks: page 2). In response: it is not clear what is meant by the applicant argument regarding the interpretation of the claimed "switchover device". The claims call for a "switchover device for at least one of..." for purpose of examination I examined the function of "one of resetting and raising the delay to one of a current starting value and a new starting value". Brosche discloses in figures 2 and 4 a device that include varying the delay by resetting a starting value according to figure 3, which reads on the claimed a switching device, since it does do the function described in the claim (see translation by applicant, page 3 line 15+ and page 10 line 20+). Further, regarding applicant's argument "There is no mention of speed measurements associated with a switchover device", this limitation is not in the claims; However, Brosche does measure the speed by taking a plurality of measurements at different distance ranges which associated with the switchover device". Therefore, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3662

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISAM ALSOMIRI whose telephone number is (571)272-6970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Tarcza can be reached on 571-272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 20, 2009

/Isam Alsomiri/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3662